

EJ Matthee for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 17- 101 Ballantyne Road Rezoning

1. My evidence assesses and makes recommendations on rezoning submissions for 101 Ballantyne Road. I have grouped these submissions into three main topics, two of which are summarised in this statement, with specific submissions addressed in each topic grouping. Overall, my recommendation is that the notified ASRZ zoning for the site should be retained.

Topic 1: Allowing for Community Activities - *Morgan Weathington (3403)*

2. This submission seeks that the ASRZ chapter be modified to permit Community Activities (as defined in Chapter 2 – Definitions) on the site.
3. Community Activities encompasses a broad range of activities, including commercial activities. The open space zones, including the ASRZ, allow for *compatible* community activities to locate within the same zone - it achieves this through different activity status' for particular community activities depending on the purpose and policy direction of the relevant OSRZ.
4. The purpose of the ASRZ clarifies a focused envelope of activities within that zone, but also allows, albeit through a non-complying consenting pathway, for activities not allocated a specific rule, or not necessarily anticipated, to be considered on a case by case basis. The relief sought in turn does not distinguish between different kinds of Community Activities.
5. I consider that the notified ASRZ is more appropriate and that permitting all Community Activities to establish within the ASRZ could result in incompatible activities locating at the Site, which would compromise the purpose of the zone. I also consider that the Site does not have any known characteristics over other sites within the ASRZ that warrants bespoke rules or special treatment and I do not consider it necessary to individually list all the community activities covered by the definition.

Topic 2: Active Sport and Recreational Zone or Industrial Zone - *Tussock Rise et al (3128, 3130, 3161, 3283, 3147)*

6. This submission generally seeks to reduce the extent of the notified ASRZ on the site while also seeking that part of the site be rezoned to General Industrial Zone (GIZ). The main reasons for the relief set out by the submitter include:
 - (a) The need to consolidate sporting facilities with the existing Recreation Centre;

-
- (b) that the site is one of a few larger sites remaining that is suitable for Industrial activities anticipated by the notified GIZ;
 - (c) that the whole site is not required for sport fields.

7. I consider their reasons to be valid however I use their same reasons to argue that the notified ASRZ should remain:

- (a) Planning to meet demand for sport fields up to 2028 will not allow for the consolidation of sporting facilities and the various benefits associated in the long term.
- (b) There is a need for other sport facilities and a need for the sport facilities to co-locate as part of larger multi-code hubs.
- (c) The site offers an opportunity to plan and zone for a large consolidated area of open space close to a key growth area of Wanaka and the ASRZ does not only provide for sport fields, but also other sport facilities, certain community facilities, open space and recreational uses with a functional need to be located in close proximity to residential areas and public transport.
- (d) The site could offer cultural and economic value by hosting larger sporting events or even non-sporting festivals, particularly given the lack of other large areas of undeveloped land available within the UGB.

8. Overall, I consider that the Site is of a size and in an ideal location to serve as a regional multi-code hub for community and recreational uses to co-locate and that the notified ARSZ zoning therefore is appropriate. I also consider that the question to be answered is 'what is the most appropriate zone for the site', not whether the site should be rezoned (in part) to deal with lost capacity through separate rezoning submissions.

9. Nevertheless, Council's evidence (Ms Hampson) demonstrates that there is sufficient GIZ capacity up to 2048. Given that half the site would only meet the medium term demand for sport fields (not even considering the other uses) up to 2028, the likely long term need for the site to be zoned ASRZ is clearly greater. This combined with the benefits of co-location, the ideal location of the site to serve the nearby residents and the potential to serve the larger district, outweighs any argument for considering other uses for the site.